

## REMARKS

The Office Action dated February 4, 2009 has been received and carefully considered. In this response, claims 13, 44, and 53 have been amended and claims 54-57 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification and drawings as originally filed. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejection in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

### **Telephonic Interview of April 1, 2009**

At the outset, the undersigned notes with appreciation the courtesies extended by the Examiner during the telephonic interview of April 1, 2009. As discussed during the telephonic interview and as discussed below, the particular combinations of features recited by claims 54-57 are novel and non-obvious in view of the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the claims to incorporate the subject matter of claims 54-57.

### **Obviousness Rejection of Claims 13, 15-29, 31-40, 43-50 and 52-57**

At page 7 of the Office Action, claims 13, 15-29, 31-40, 43-50 and 52-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eifrig (U.S. Patent No. 6,748,020) in view of Pian (U.S. Patent No. 6,366,614).

Independent claim 13 has been amended to recite the additional features of dependent claims 54 and 56. Independent claim 44 and 53 likewise have been amended to recite the additional features of claims 57 and 55, respectively. Thus, each of these independent claims presently provide that the packetized/parsed video packets stored in memory and then subsequently accessed by a second processor have a format independent of the video standard of the data stream from which they are based. At page 12 of the Office Action, the Office states that this aspect would have been obvious in that it would have been “obvious to keep a format of the plurality of packets independent from a video standard of the video data, since it would help to save time by not having to modify the system to comply with ever changing digital video standard[s]”. Applicants note that neither Eifrig nor Pian expresses any concern over changing digital video standards, nor do these references provide that their “packets” have a format

independent of the video standard of the data stream. Moreover, the Office does not establish that the desirability of stored packets with a video-standard independent format was well known at the time of filing of the Present Application, much less that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement such an aspect in the system resulting from the combination of the teachings of Eifrig and Pian. Accordingly, independent claims 13, 44, and 53 presently are allowable over proposed combination of Eifrig and Pian, as are claims 15-29, 31-40, 43, 45-50, and 52 at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from one of claims 14, 44, or 53. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection therefore is respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-1835.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ryan S. Davidson/  
Ryan S. Davidson, Reg. No. 51,596  
LARSON NEWMAN ABEL & POLANSKY, LLP  
5914 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 200  
Austin, Texas 78730  
(512) 439-7100 (phone)  
(512) 439-7199 (fax)

April 13, 2009  
Date